

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 29 June 2005. Responsive to the Office Action, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to clarify the language thereof. Additionally, Claim 4 has been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Disclosure and the Abstract for informalities therein. In response to this objection, the Abstract and the Specification have been amended to correct any informalities.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 1 due to informalities. The informalities objected to regarding Claim 1 have been corrected by this Amendment.


In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that the claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended and now particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Furthermore, Claim 4 has been cancelled by this Amendment.

The references cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection have been reviewed and are believed to be further remote from the subject inventive concept as now defined by the amended claims than that used by the Examiner in his rejection.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE


David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 28 Sept. 2005

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Client No. 04586